

Amendments to the Drawings

Applicants request to amend the drawings currently pending in the Application by substituting the one replacement drawing sheet enclosed herewith, containing Figure 1, for the drawing sheets currently pending.

Figure 1 has been corrected to remove the extraneous word "therefore" in the box labeled "Communication Port" (28). No new matter will be added as a result of this substitution. Permission to amend the drawings by substitution is respectfully requested.

REMARKS

In response to the Election/Restriction requirement in the Action, Applicants provisionally elect with traverse Group I (claims 1-28).

Also, claim 2 has been amended herein to correct a typographical error. Claims 1-83 remain pending in the Application. No new matter has been added. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Election/Restriction

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office has not established that the election/restriction requirement is proper. The Action states that the alleged subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. However, the Action has not proven that the alleged subcombinations are separately usable.

For example, the Action alleges that Group I claims 1-28 have separate utility such as digital rights management. However, the claims in Groups II, IV, and V, and claim 54 in Group III are all directed to using a private key to sign electronic documents. So the Action has not established why the alleged use of digital rights management would not apply to the claims in these other groups as well.

In addition, the Action alleges that Group II claims (29-50) have separate utility such as signing real estate documents. However, all the claims can be used to generate legally binding signatures for electronic documents such as real estate documents. Thus, the Action has not established that the claims in Group II have separate utility.

Also, the Action alleges that Group III claims (51-56) have separate utility such as authorizing a credit card transaction. However, none of the claims recite features which preclude

them from also authorizing credit card transactions. Thus the Action has not established why authorizing credit card transactions allegedly only applies to Group III claims.

Further, the Action alleges that Group IV claims (57-70) have separate utility such as performing banking functions at an ATM. However, none of the claims are precluded from applying to ATMs that perform banking functions. Further, at least one dependent claim in each group recites a banking function such as dispensing cash (e.g., claims 3, 31, 53, 60, and 82).

In addition, the Action alleges that Group V claims (71-83) have separate utility such as validating a public/private key pair. However, the Action has not established why the claims in the other groups cannot also have this same utility.

As the Action has not established why the alleged separate utilities for the respective groups cannot be carried out by the claims in the other alleged groups, Applicants respectfully submit that the restriction requirement is improper and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The undersigned will be happy to discuss any aspect of the Application by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Ralph E. Jocke Reg. No. 31,029
231 South Broadway
Medina, Ohio 44256
(330) 722-5143